

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-26, and 28-33 remain pending in the present application with claim 2 having been canceled by way of this amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Applicants have amended these claims to overcome the lack of antecedent basis problems in the original claims.

The Examiner has set forth a number of prior art rejections; however, the Examiner only uses a few primary references and therefore, Applicants' remarks focus more heavily on these primary references.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green in view of Johnson. Now canceled claim 2 is rejected under these references and the Sultanaki reference. Applicants traverse these rejections on the following grounds.

Green only discloses using a chalkcloth fabric in a number of settings, including as a table cloth, and does mention that a fabric border can be added around the chalkcloth fabric. The Examiner looks to the Sultanaki reference for teaching on the suitability of oil cloth as a tablecloth. The Johnson reference merely discloses a standard hard chalk board having guide lines. While oil cloth is mentioned in Sultanaki as a material to form a table cloth, there is absolutely no teaching that this material has the desired "chalk" characteristics since there is absolutely no mention that chalk is to be applied to the cloth. The oil cloth surface is provided for a completely different purpose, namely to provide a surface that is easily washable.

The newly formulated amended claim 1 recites an interactive table cloth that includes a foldable substrate processed to receive chalk on a writing surface. The substrate is formed of an oil cloth material that has one face that is processed so that the user can write with chalk thereon and at the same time, the chalk is easily erased therefrom. A guide is provided and is a permanent part of

the writing surface by being attached to the oil cloth material and being indicative of where chalk is to be applied.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references, including those that disclose the use of oil cloth as a substrate either to provide a nice wipe surface as in Sultanaki or a chalk surface as in the Elizabeth Margaret web site, none of these references disclose a product where a permanent guide or indicia is disposed on the oil cloth to assist the user in performing a certain task. While the Examiner cites Johnson, Sullivan and other references for the teaching of placing markings on a chalk board surface, all of these references deal with conventional hard, rigid chalk board surfaces. In other words, none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses providing and permanently attaching a guide to a flexible, foldable surface, such as the oil cloth substrate. All of the indicia and guides in the cited reference are attached to hard surfaces, such as conventional chalk boards, which are much different than the chalk writing surface of the claimed oil cloth. Further, the Elizabeth Margaret site is silent as to this aspect also.

For at least these foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, should be allowed.

Claims 3-12 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 1, as amended.

Claim 13 is directed to an interactive educational kit that includes a table cloth including a foldable substrate processed to receive chalk on a writing surface thereof and being washable so as to permit erasing of any chalk marks made on the substrate such that the substrate appears substantially new after cleaning. The substrate is formed of an oil cloth material that has one face that is processed so that the user can write with chalk thereon. The kit further includes a container that is open at a first end for receiving and holding the table cloth in a rolled condition, as well as an end plug for holding the writing implement, the end plug being received within the container after the rolled table cloth is received therein so as to close the open first end of the container and secure all contents of the container.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 13 for the following reasons. The kit of claim 13 includes a table cloth formed of oil cloth and including a guide formed thereon. Applicants will not repeat the arguments made with respect to claim 1; however, the Examiner is alerted to the fact that the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 are applicable to the examination of amended claim 13.

Moreover, the kit of claim 13 recites that the table cloth is rolled and placed in a container. The container is open ended at one end thereof and an end plug is provided to close off the container with the rolled table cloth being formed therein and further, as shown in Fig. 14 of the specification, the end plug part that lies adjacent the rolled table cloth. Applicants respectfully submit that the relationship between the rolled table cloth and the presence of an end plug, with the claimed structure, is not disclosed or suggested in any of the references. The Examiner references the "Spongy Eraser" reference for the provision of some type of packaging; however, this reference really does not provide any substantive teaching that is relevant to the claimed kit. No mention of an end plug is in this reference or in any other of the cited references.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claim 13, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 14-26 and 28-33 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 13, as amended. In addition, at least some of these claims contain patentable subject matter in and of themselves. For example, claim 33 recites that the end plug is formed of a canister that receives and holds the writing implement and a cover that is positioned across an open end of the canister and closes off the open end of the container. Applicants contend that this arrangement is not shown in any of the references.

Once again, the secondary references that are mentioned by the Examiner do not cure the deficiencies of the primary art and merely, show various features formed on a hard, rigid chalk board which is not the same and does not receive the same considerations as an oil cloth fabric.

